6-1988

A Study of the Effects of Writing Instruction Versus Writing and Reading Instruction on 10th Grade English Students

Patricia E.G. Craig

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF WRITING INSTRUCTION VERSUS WRITING AND READING INSTRUCTION ON 10th GRADE ENGLISH STUDENTS

A Project

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Teacher Education

in School Administration

Western Kentucky University

Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Specialist in Education

by

Patricia E. G. Craig

June 1988

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF THESIS

Permission is hereby

☒ granted to the Western Kentucky University Library to make, or allow to be made photocopies, microfilm or other copies of this thesis for appropriate research or scholarly purposes.

☐ reserved to the author for the making of any copies of this thesis except for brief sections for research or scholarly purposes.

Signed Patricia J. Craig

Date 7-15-88

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box.

This form will be filed with the original of the thesis and will control future use of the thesis.

WKU—Printing paid from state funds. KRS 57.375

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF WRITING

INSTRUCTION VERSUS WRITING AND READING INSTRUCTION

ON 10th GRADE ENGLISH STUDENTS

Recommended June 24, 1988

Robert D. Schrader
Director of Project

Phil Courey

Carl W. Greider

Approved July 15, 1988
(Date)

Elmer Gray
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express appreciation to those who helped move this study toward completion. Thanks go to Dr. Robert Schrader, Dr. Carl Kriesler, Dr. Philip Constans, Karen Hudson, Dr. Robert Panchyshyn, Robert Cobb, and the students in the two groups.

Special thanks go to my family for their encouragement and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF WRITING

INSTRUCTION VERSUS WRITING AND READING INSTRUCTION

ON 10th GRADE ENGLISH STUDENTS

Patricia E. G. Craig June 1988 54 pages

Directed by: Robert Schrader, Carl Kriesler, Philip Constans

Department of Teacher Education
School Administration

Western Kentucky
University

The effects of writing instruction as opposed to writing and reading instruction were studied on 10th grade English students' reading comprehension and writing. Two groups (classes) completed pretests and pre-sample writings. Then, both groups were given writing instruction while only one group was given related reading skills instruction. Finally, both groups completed posttests and post-sample writings.

An analysis of covariance of the pre- and posttest data was done. It revealed no significant difference between the two groups related to reading comprehension. However, a significant difference existed between the two groups related to language expression (editing skills or writing sub-skills). The group who received writing and reading instruction experienced a decline in scores. Also, the Wilcoxon signed-rank matched-pairs test indicated that both groups' writing increased significantly.

Two conclusions were reached from this study. The first conclusion related to classroom instruction. Writing instruction improves student writing. Further, direct reading skills instruction should be included only to meet a specific

class need (since writing sub-skills may suffer). Therefore, integration of writing and reading instruction should be determined by class need. Second, more empirical research related to the effectiveness of the integration of writing and reading instruction is needed.

CHAPTER I

High school English has traditionally been taught as grammar or writing and literature or reading, the two being taught as essentially separate components. However, in 1986 the Kentucky Department of Education encouraged the integration of reading and writing and the teaching of specific skills in the context of reading and writing instruction. Further, the state department specified that writing instruction should be process writing.

The Kentucky Department of Education believed in the process to the extent that funds were made available to provide for (a) writing institutes (five-week, summer classes offered at regional colleges), (b) writing workshops (which were provided for representatives from all school systems during the 1986-1987 school year), and (c) grants (available for the development of writing curriculum). The funding was provided under KRS 158.770 (1986). This emphasis was an effort to help English teachers learn to instruct using the process writing method. This method includes the steps: prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing.

Process writing encourages the integration of writing and reading. The five steps of process writing, prewriting,

drafting, revising, editing, and polishing, force the student to act as both writer and reader. The prewriting step is basically the initial step in which the teacher sets the stage for writing. Prewriting may include such activities as reading, using art or music, brainstorming, teacher modeling, or specific skill instruction. Drafting involves the student, as writer, in a writing situation prescribed by the teacher. The revising and editing steps involve the student in both reading and writing. The student must first read, acting as audience, then revise and edit (to clarify, amplify, or correct), acting as writer. These two steps, revising and editing, may be repeated, and they also may be managed on an individual or group basis. The publishing step is the sharing of the final draft of the writing. This step may allow the student to function as reader (audience) for other students' writings. Hence, the integration of writing and reading is intrinsic to process writing.

Further indicating the significance of the change in instruction, publishers have altered their textbooks by incorporating the process writing instructional steps in the grammar or writing textbooks and by correlating the grammar or writing textbook to the reading or literature textbook. For example, the Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers' 1988 correlation of the Adventures literature series and the English Composition and Grammar provides lesson plans, a correlation chart, and writing assignments

showing how to integrate grammar or writing and literature or reading. Also, MacMillan has developed literature-based grammar exercises. These exercises provide practice of a grammar or writing skill using a literature or reading assignment.

These changes in curriculum cause secondary English teachers to examine the effectiveness of process writing instruction and to examine the value of reading skills instruction. This concern arises with the teachers' desire to provide effective skills instruction through a well-planned curriculum.

Need for the Study

The continuing search for effective instruction is the heart of the motive for undertaking this study. Current changes in English curriculum cause educators to examine the effectiveness of writing instruction and/or reading instruction. It is the intent of this study to determine the effectiveness of integrating the instruction of writing and reading skills.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine whether an integrated approach to writing and reading instruction is more effective than writing instruction only, with regard to reading comprehension skills and to writing skills.

Statement of the Problem

(1) Will 10th grade English students who are taught a combination of writing and reading skills attain higher achievement in reading comprehension skills than 10th grade English students who are taught writing skills only?

(2) Will 10th grade English students who are taught a combination of writing and reading skills better use writing skills than 10th grade English students who are taught writing skills only?

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In most curriculums today, instructional procedures are based upon a linear view of language development -- listening precedes speaking, which precedes reading, which develops before writing. Traditionally, educators have viewed writing and reading as distinctly separate skills. Therefore, instructional practice has focused on isolated skills to be practiced and analyzed in artificial settings. Recently, however, some educators have suggested that writing activities should either precede or occur simultaneously with reading instruction (DeFord, 1981).

Current Views

It is now believed that reading and writing are interrelated. Tierney and Pearson (1983) indicated that reading and writing are multiple types of processes, both being acts of composing. Writers are composing meaning as they record their thoughts on paper; readers are composing meaning as they process the written text. A somewhat similar viewpoint was presented by Wittrock (1983), who believed that good reading and effective writing involve similar processes that create meaning by building relationships between the text and what one knows, believes,

and experiences. Smith (1983) explained that children can learn to write (compose written material) like a writer from what they read by reading like a writer. Atwell (1984) stated that "we read writing just as we write reading" (p. 241).

Goodman and Goodman (1983) pointed out that "all of the schemata for predicting texts in reading are essentially the same as those used in constructing texts during writing" (p. 591). Eckhoff (1983) studied possible effects of reading on children's writing and found that their writing clearly contained features of their reading texts. Because reading and writing are related, learning in one mode is believed to have a positive effect on the other (Wilson, 1981). Calkins (1983) explained that before participating in a case-study research project she had viewed writing as "active and expressive" and reading as "passive and receptive." She had assumed they required separate skills. However, she discovered that there was no way to "watch writing without watching reading" (p. 83).

Shanahan (1984) suggested that some unique aspects of reading or writing probably are best dealt with separately, "but in those areas of substantial overlaps, integrated instruction might allow for maximum achievement in both reading and writing, with maximum efficiency" (p. 475).

Despite the theoretical viewpoints, little is actually known regarding the exact nature of the reading and writing

relationship. Stotsky's (1983) review of the literature led her to determine the following:

1. Correlational studies show almost consistently that better writers tend to be better readers and to read more than poor readers, and that better readers tend to produce more syntactically mature writing than poorer readers.

2. Experimental studies that used writing exercises primarily to improve writing did not tend to produce significant effects on reading. But almost all studies that used such procedures specifically to improve reading comprehension found small but significant gains in reading.

3. Studies that attempted to improve writing by providing reading experiences in place of grammar study or additional writing practice found reading to be as beneficial as, or more beneficial than, the experiences they replaced. But almost all studies that sought to improve writing through reading instruction were ineffective.

Thus, Stotsky concluded that writing instruction is not a substitute for reading instruction, nor is the converse true. However, "it is possible that reading experience may be as critical a factor in developing writing ability as writing instruction itself" (p. 637).

Lapointe (1986) stated that the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) "achievement data confirm that better readers are better writers and that the two skills are systematically related" (p. 138). Collins

(1985) summarized research related to reading and writing: poor readers have parallel writing problems, reading enhances writing skill, and perhaps knowledge of one is a predictor of the other. Collins explained the concept of the parallel functions as

> the assumption that the thinking processes of the writer complement the reader's reception of the material when the reader is aware of the relation between the two. Conversely, the thinking processes of the reader complement the writer's generation of text when the writer is aware of the connection between the two (p. 53).

Practical Applications

Aulls (1985) stated that [reading] comprehension and composition have not been taught directly and that teachers must teach processes directly to help children "learn how to learn to read and write" (p. 43).

Instruction in process writing should clarify the relationship between writing and reading. Teaching strategies should begin with the well-structured (or teacher-centered instruction) and move toward helping students become independent learners. Therefore, process writing instruction should involve some direct instructional principles. This concept of direct instruction received official endorsement in the United States Department of Education publication What Works (1986).

Rosenshine (1986) used the results of effective teaching studies to identify "six teaching functions: review, presentation of new material, guided practice, feedback and corrections, independent practice, and weekly and monthly reviews" (p. 64). He explained that explicit instruction is a progression moving "from teacher modeling, through guided practice using prompts and cues, to independent and fluent performance by the learner" (p. 69). Even though Rosenshine comments that direct instruction is "less relevant for teaching in areas that are less well-structured," (p. 60) such as teaching composition and reading comprehension, "results have consistently shown that when teachers teach more systematically, student achievement improves" (p. 69).

Process writing instruction includes five of Rosenshine's direct instructional functions. The prewriting step often involves review and presentation of new material. The drafting, revising, and editing steps may be considered guided practice. Also the revising and editing steps involve feedback and corrections, often from the students' response group as well as from teacher monitoring. The publishing step may be the independent practice since the student must decide when his writing is complete (or adequate). Hence, process writing follows the direct instructional principle of moving from teacher-oriented instruction (in the prewriting step) to independent student practice (in the steps of final revision and publishing).

Flood, Lapp, and Farnan (1986) expressed their belief in direct instruction of reading and writing. Students learn how expository paragraphs are written not only from reading but also by attempting to write. "As students attempt to control structure through writing, they gain insight into the fact that writers organize their information to maximize the reader's comprehension" (p. 558).

Literature reveals many techniques for integrating writing and reading instruction. Even though some techniques focus on composition while others focus on reading, in the final analysis all techniques require instruction in both areas.

Goodman and Goodman (1983) have identified several activities that focus on the practical functions of reading and writing. These activities include list-making, diary writing, journal writing, function writing, and note and letter writing. They "believe that development in reading and writing can occur only if people actively participate in reading and writing experiences which have significant and personal meaning for the user" (p. 599).

Hennings (1982) explained that the schema, or understandings, a child brings to the reading of a selection is important to comprehension. Schemata include conceptions of how written content is structured. Hennings suggested that students be introduced to the structures through which ideas are organized in written form through an instructional sequence in which writing is a key component. Students

move from being constructors of content to interpreters of it through this sequence of teaching/learning strategies: (a) factstorming, (b) categorizing of facts stormed, (c) dratting paragraphs that focus on one category of fact, (d) sequencing paragraphs, (e) drafting introductions and conclusions, (f) organizing the parts into a cohesive report, (g) interpreting similar pieces of discourse, and (h) summarizing, synthesizing, and judging -- the actual writing.

Thomas (1981) explained that the "close connection between reading, writing, re-writing, and re-reading makes reader response criticism as important for the teaching of writing as for the teaching of reading" (p. 1). Hence, "students must learn, then, . . . in order to write an essay, they must become readers of their essays and that re-writing is that occasion allowing them to play the role of reader" (p. 2).

Trosky and Wood (1982) encouraged the use of a writing model to teach reading. They linked a three-staged sequential model of the writing process, composing, transcribing, and editing, to an analogous process of reading, recomposing (questions about the facts), reflecting (questions about the author's technique), reacting (questions about reader's personal impressions of facts). They explained that this model shows reading and writing are complementary.

Silvers (1986) discussed her change in educational philosophy as a skill-based reading instructor. She has

begun to include teaching process writing (prewriting, drafting, revising, rewriting, conferencing, editing, and publishing) and to include more free reading. She stated that this instruction has caused her bored/underachieving students to become "confident, successful, thinking readers and writers" (p. 584).

Cunningham and Cunningham (1987) explained that reading-writing lessons engage students in reading to confirm knowledge and to find new information. As students explain the text, they see how language works. In writing, students see writing modeled; then they write similarly.

Sauers (1987) encouraged instructors to use a blend of reading and writing combined with a bit of rhetoric (the effective use of language).

One method of integrating writing and reading involves presenting literature as a pattern. Askew (1983) suggested using Gothic writing as one pattern since it is stylized and Gothic plots have certain common elements. Hence, students are required to read, then write, patterning their style to the model. Askew's "Gothic Route" is similar to direct instruction. Cowin (1986) also detailed a project using literature as a part of process writing. Included in the project were prewriting activities drawn from the students' own experiences, imaginative literature, expansion of the students' descriptive abilities, and the revision and editing process.

Heffron (1986) explained that the microcomputer may be used as an additional tool in reading and writing instruction. Reading is learned, said Heffron, through oral and written activities; writing is learned by attending reading as a writer, composing orally, reading drafts, and revising; and, computer programs lend themselves to this concept.

Summary

Hence, research indicates that reading and writing skills are mutually dependent. Additionally, process writing adheres to the direct instructional principles. Finally, techniques for integrating reading and writing instruction are available in current educational literature. Therefore, the concerned educator has available resources for implementation of integrated instruction of writing and reading skills; then, he or she may examine the effectiveness of such instruction.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Methodology

The sample included 57 tenth-grade English students (26 males, 31 females) from Butler County High School of Morgantown, Kentucky, 26 students (11 male, 15 female) in the 10:30 a.m. class and 31 students (15 male, 16 female) in the 2:05 p.m. class, both taught by Patricia Craig. This high school is the only one in the county. The 57 students took the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills in April, 1985, and their cognitive skills index (CSI) scores ranged 50 points, varying from 91 to 141. Their CSI mean score was 118.73; their CSI trimodal scores were 109, 112, and 115; and their CSI median score was 116. Since one student was not tested in 1985, this student was excluded from the sample.

The procedures involved first administering pretests and taking a pre-sample of student writing. Then, two types of instruction were provided, writing instruction to one class and writing-reading instruction to the other. Posttests were given and a post-sample of student writing was taken. An analysis of reading and writing achievement was based on pre- and post-evaluations.

The instruction involved two 10th-grade English classes. The 10:30 a.m. class was taught writing skills. The 2:05 p.m. class was taught a combination of writing and reading skills. Both classes were instructed in the same writing skills; however, the 2:05 p.m. class was given instruction in corresponding reading skills.

The instruction was planned for six weeks of classwork although it actually required seven weeks (see Appendix A). The reading comprehension subskills were closely related to the writing objective in each lesson plan. The sequence of writing skills -- sentence, paragraph, whole essay -- and the emphasis on topic sentences, transitions, and paragraph coherence focused on skills measured by the Kentucky Essential Skills Test (KEST). Eight reading comprehension subskills were identified. Six subskills (main idea, sequence of events, author's purpose, cause-effect relations, fact-opinion, and point of view) were presented at least two times; the seventh, identifying details, had one instance of direct instruction, but was integral to all lessons; persuasion, taught only in the last lesson, was directly related to that writing objective. All eight reading skills are also measured by the KEST for this grade level.

Instrumentation

The measurement tool selected was the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), Forms U and V, level J. The sections of the tests chosen for pretesting and posttesting

were Reading Comprehension and Language Expression. The pretest was taken in Form U and the posttest in Form V.

Robert L. Linn reviewed the CTBS, Forms U and V, for The Ninth Mental Measurements Yearbook: Vol. I (1985). He stated that "evidence supporting the validity of the interpretations and suggested uses of the various scores is rather scanty" (p. 383), but comparable to the evidence provided for similar test batteries. He explained that content validity is viewed as a matter of judgment. Linn determined that Forms U and V provide "comparable measurement over a given score range" (p. 384). He concluded that the CTBS is a professional product and worthy of consideration.

Lorrie A. Shephard, aiso reviewing the CTBS-U for The Ninth Mental Measurements Yearbook: Vol. I (1985), stated that she could not rank one battery above the other based on content validity since this must be determined by local curriculums. However, she explained that her impressions of content were favorable. Shephard stated that the tests are adequate regarding reliability. She concluded that the CTBS-U is "one of the best developed standardized achievement test batteries available" (p. 389).

The CTBS Language Expression test measures recognition and editing skills (writing subskills), but does not actually measure writing ability. In order to measure writing ability, students must be asked to generate writing. Therefore, the pre-sample writing and the post-sample writing were used to measure writing ability. The prompts used for the two

writing samples were similar. Students were asked to become an object and write a description from that selected vantage point (see Appendix B).

The writing samples were evaluated by a panel of three high school English teachers using a rating scale of one through five (see Appendix C). These ratings were transformed to a grading scale in which 1, deficient, corresponded to 52; 2, poor, to 64; 3, average, to 76; 4, good, to 88; and 5, excellent, to 100. Then, the three evaluations for each writing sample were averaged.

Data Analysis

An analysis of covariance was used with the CTBS data to determine significant difference of achievement within each group and between groups.

The Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test was used with the pre- and post-sample writing data (which was based on an ordinal scale) for testing "the direction of differences between pairs (when two measures for the same individual are taken, these are considered to represent a 'pair'), but also the relative magnitude of the difference" (Popham and Sirotnik, 1973, p. 275). Hence, the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test measured the significance of difference between the two writing samples (pre- and post-) of each student in the two groups, a measure within groups, not between groups.

Internal and External Validity

Two threats to the internal validity of the study exist. One threat to the internal validity of the study is the time of day for instruction. The class receiving writing instruction only meets as 10:30 a.m. and the class receiving a combination of reading and writing instruction meets at 2:05 p.m. The difference in time may affect the teacher's instruction as well as the students' learning. A second threat to internal validity is the building schedule. Since band is only offered at 2:05 p.m., 10th grade, college-bound students participating in band must be scheduled for English at 10:30 a.m.

Two threats to the external validity of the study exist. First, the study included only 10th grade students from Butler County, Kentucky. Second, students in the two classes are in the college-bound track. Students enter the college-bound track by choice.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

No significant difference (.05 level of significance) was found between the reading comprehension scores of 10th grade English students who were taught a combination of writing and reading skills and those taught writing skills only. The main effects for the total population (a measure of the posttest controlled for the pretest) had a significant F ratio of .746 (see Table 1). Hence, 10th grade English students who are taught a combination of writing and reading skills do not achieve significantly higher in reading comprehension skills than 10th grade English students who are taught writing skills only.

A significant difference (.05 level of significance) existed between language expression scores (writing sub-skills as measured by the CTBS) of 10th grade English students who were taught a combination of writing and reading skills and those taught writing skills only. The main effect for the total population had a significant F ratio of .019 (see Table 2).

The language expression pretest mean for the entire population was 752.6250, the writing group 752.1923, and the writing-reading group 753 (see Table 3). However, the posttest mean for the entire population was 752.3036, the writing group 755.9615, and the writing-reading group

Table 1

Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Forms U and V, Level J, Reading Comprehension

Analysis of Covariance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sign. of F
Covariates	26363.047	1	26363.047	52.397	0.000
ReadPre	26363.047	1	26363.047	52.397	0.000
Main Effects	53.281	1	53.281	0.106	0.746
Group	53.282	1	53.282	0.106	0.746

Table 2

Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Forms U and V, Level J, Language Expression

Analysis of Covariance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sign. of F
Covariates	8226.953	1	8226.953	66.969	0.000
LangPre	8226.953	1	8226.953	66.969	0.000
Main Effects	715.941	1	715.941	5.828	0.019
Group	715.940	1	715.940	5.828	0.019

Table 3

Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, Form U, Level J, Language Expression

Criterion Variable: Language Pretest
Broken Down by Group

Variable	Sum	Mean	Std. Dev.	Variance	N
Entire Population	42147.0000	752.6250	29.0088	841.5114	56
Group W	19557.0000	752.1923	20.8653	435.3615	26
Group WR	22590.000	753.0000	34.9334	1220.3448	30

749.1333 (see Table 4). Hence, a significant difference was found in the performance of the writing-reading group. The writing-reading group pretest mean of 753 fell to 749.1333 (significant with an F ratio of .019). Thus, 10th grade English students who are taught a combination of writing and reading skills do not use writing sub-skills better than 10th grade English students who are taught writing skills only.

A significant difference (.05 level of significance) was found between pre-sample writing and post-sample writing of 10th grade English students receiving both the writing and writing-reading methods of instruction. The T value for the writing group was 54.5 and for the writing-reading group was 62.5 (see Tables 5 and 6). The T value was then used to compute the value of z (Popham & Sirotnik, 1973, pp. 292-293). The value of z for the writing group was -3.04 and for the writing-reading group was -3.47. The z values were interpreted from a table of the normal curve to be significant (Popham & Sirotnik, 1973, pp. 380-381). Therefore, 10th grade English students who are taught writing skills better use writing skills regardless of which method of instruction is used.

Implications

The findings of this study have several implications for application and further research. They directly concern the high school English teacher but also may be of interest

Table 4

Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, Form V, Level J, Language Expression

Criterion Variable: Language Posttest
Broken Down by Group

Variable	Sum	Mean	Std. Dev.	Variance	N
Entire Population	42129.0000	752.3036	16.7624	280.9789	56
Group W	19655.0000	755.9615	16.7630	280.9985	26
Group WR	22474.0000	749.1333	16.3786	268.2575	30

Table 5

Writing Instruction Group's Scores Classified According to Pre- and Post-instructional Scores

Student Number	Evaluation: Pre-writing Sample	Evaluation: Post-writing Sample	Difference	Rank of Difference	Rank with less Frequent Sign
01W	80	80	0		
02W	76	76	0		
03W	76	88	12	15	
04W	88	76	-12	-15	15
05W	76	76	0		
06W	88	88	0		
07W	76	72	- 4	- 4	4
08W	76	84	8	10.5	
09W	76	88	12	15	
10W	88	64	-24	-17	17
11W	72	80	8	10.5	
12W	80	76	- 4	- 4	4

table continues

Table 5 (continued)

Waiting Instruction Group's Scores Classified According to Pre- and Post-instructional Scores

Student Number	Evaluation: Pre-writing Sample	Evaluation: Post-writing Sample	Difference	Rank of Difference	Rank with less Frequent Sign
13W	84	88	4	4	
14W	76	76	0		
15W	88	88	0		
16W	76	76	0		
17W	64	68	4	4	
18W	88	80	- 8	-10.5	10.5
19W	80	84	4	4	
20W	76	80	4	4	
21W	80	76	- 4	- 4	4
22W	76	84	8	10.5	
23W	76	84	8	10.5	
24W	76	76	0		

table continues

Table 5 (continued)

Writing Instruction Group's Scores Classified According to Pre- and Post-instructional Scores

Student Number	Evaluation: Pre-writing Sample	Evaluation: Post-writing Sample	Difference	Rank of Difference	Rank with less Frequent Sigh
25W	88	88	0		
26W	76	84	8	10.5	
					T = 54.5

Table 6

Writing-Reading Instruction Group's Scores Classified According to Pre- and Post-instructional Scores

Student Number	Evaluation: Pre-writing Sample	Evaluation: Post-writing Sample	Difference	Rank of Difference	Rank with less Frequent Sign
27WR	80	76	- 4	- 6	6
28WR	76	72	- 4	- 6	6
29WR	72	88	14	22	
30WR	64	68	4	6	
31WR	76	80	4	6	
32WR	88	84	- 4	- 6	6
33WR	88	88	0		
34WR	68	64	- 4	- 6	6
35WR	80	80	0		
36WR	76	76	0		
37WR	76	84	8	14.5	

table continues

Table 6 (continued)

Writing-Reading Instruction Group's Scores Classified According to Pre- and Post-instructional Scores

Student Number	Evaluation: Pre-writing Sample	Evaluation: Post-writing Sample	Difference	Rank of Difference	Rank with less Frequent Sign
38WR	76	88	12	19.5	
39WR	72	76	4	6	
40WR	68	76	8	14.5	
41WR	68	68	0		
42WR	88	88	0		
43WR	76	76	0		
44WR	76	72	- 4	- 6	6
45WR	72	68	- 4	- 6	6
46WR	76	88	12	19.5	
47WR	88	80	- 8	-14.5	14.5
48WR	76	88	12	19.5	

table continues

Table 6 (continued)

Writing-Reading Instruction Group's Scores Classified According to Pre- and Post-instructional Scores

Student Number	Evaluation: Pre-writing Sample	Evaluation: Post-writing Sample	Difference	Rank of Difference	Rank with less Frequent Sign
49WR	76	76	0		
50WR	76	76	0		
51WR	72	80	8	14.5	
52WR	76	72	- 4	- 6	6
53WR	76	72	- 4	- 6	6
54WR	80	88	8	14.5	
55WR	72	80	8	14.5	
56WR	76	88	12	19.5	
					T 62.5

to other educators (e.g., teachers of English in other grade levels, teachers of content subjects who incorporate reading skills instruction, administrators).

Since no significant difference was found between the two groups regarding reading comprehension, one implication is that English teachers may choose to omit direct instruction of reading skills unless a specific class need is observed. A second implication is that writing instruction improves student writing (as observed in the analysis of the pre- and post-sample writings).

A third implication is related to the significant decline found between the two groups regarding language expression (writing sub-skills). This decline of language expression occurred when direct reading skills instruction was incorporated. The classroom instructional time devoted to reading skills instruction decreased the classroom instructional time available for specific editing skills within the context of students' writing (the process writing steps, editing and revising). Therefore, the teacher must determine the goals and objectives for instruction relevant to the class involved. Hence, the teacher may allocate instructional time using professional judgement of class needs.

Finally, since a large body of current literature supports an integrated approach to writing and reading instruction, further research is also implicated. This study involved a small sample (56) for a brief period of

time (seven weeks); the data from a longer study involving a larger population might yield different results. Additionally, research might be extended to other grade levels and include all ability levels.

Summary

This study has been limited in scope. However, the findings of the study have provided the researcher with two conclusions.

The first conclusion relates to classroom instruction. Process writing instruction improves student writing. Thus, Rosenshine's (1986) statement that "when teachers teach more systematically, student achievement improves" (p. 69) and Aulls' (1985) statement that teachers must teach processes directly to help children "learn how to learn to . . . write" (p. 43) seem well-founded. Additionally, direct reading skills instruction should be included in an English class only to meet specific class need (since writing sub-skills may suffer). Therefore, the practice of integrating writing and reading instruction in an English class should be based only on a specific class need. Thus, Stotsky's (1983) conclusion that neither writing instruction nor reading instruction substitutes for the other appears to be substantiated.

Due to the small population and brief period of time of this study, the second conclusion is that research of the integration of writing and reading instruction must be

expanded before a definitive conclusion can be reached. More research with empirical data as to the integration of writing and reading instruction, such as this study, is needed to determine the effectiveness of such instruction.

Appendix A

English 10 Lesson Plans

Period III: Writing

Period VI: Writing - Reading

Lesson Plan I

WRITING OBJECTIVES:

To identify the main idea as the topic sentence.

To summarize specified material.

READING OBJECTIVES:

To identify in a writing passage the main idea, the sequence, and the author's purpose.

PURPOSE: To summarize the main idea(s) of an article.

AUDIENCE: The members of the class and the teacher.

PROCEDURE TIME: One week

ACTIVITIES:

Writing

1. Identify the topic sentence in sample paragraphs.
2. Make up the topic sentence for sample paragraphs.
3. Identify the main idea(s) in a newspaper or

Reading

1. Identify the main idea in sample paragraphs.

appendix A continues

Appendix A (continued)

magazine article by underlining key words.

2. Identify sequence of events in sample paragraph.
3. Identify the author's purpose in sample passages.
4. Write a rough-draft paragraph summarizing the main idea(s) of a newspaper or magazine article.
5. Revise and edit paragraphs in response groups.
6. Publish: Give the final draft to the teacher.

EVALUATION:

1) Informal: Teacher observation

2) Formal: Final draft of paragraph

- -

Lesson Plan II

WRITING OBJECTIVES:

To identify unity within a paragraph.

READING OBJECTIVES:

To identify in a written passage the main idea,

appendix A continues

Appendix A (continued)

To use transition within a paragraph (e.g., time, place, addition, contrast, summary/conclusion). details, cause-effect, and sequence.

PURPOSE: To write a unifed paragraph using transition.

AUDIENCE: Members of the response group and the teacher.

PROCEDURE TIME: One week

ACTIVITIES:

Writing

1. Identify unity within sample paragraphs.
2. Identify transitional expressions within sample paragraphs.
3. Read "I Find Fool Gold" by Mark Twain.

Reading

1. Identify the main idea and the supporting details in sample paragraphs.
2. Identify cause-effect relations within sample paragraphs.
3. Identify sequence of events in sample paragraphs.

appendix A continues

Appendix A (continued)

4. Group work: Select one unified paragraph which includes transition to be read to the class by a member of the group.
5. Write a unified paragraph using transition about some happening. This may be a brief, entertaining anecdote which makes a point (rough-draft form).
6. Revise and edit paragraphs in response groups.
7. Publish: Give the final draft to the teacher.

EVALUATION:

1) Informal: Teacher observation
2) Formal: Final draft of paragraph

- -

Lesson Plan III

WRITING OBJECTIVES:

To summarize specified material.

To express a value judgement about

READING OBJECTIVES

To identify in a written passage fact-opinion, point of view, and author's purpose.

appendix A continues

Appendix A (continued)

specified material
(e.g., strengths,
weaknesses).
To write a connected
series of paragraphs.

PURPOSE: To critique a magazine article in a series of connected paragraphs.

AUDIENCE: Students, faculty, and visitors during open-house.

PROCEDURE TIME: One week

ACTIVITIES:

Writing

1. Read three critiques as models for writing.
2. List the main idea(s) found in a magazine article.
3. Write a rough-draft paragraph summarizing the main idea(s) of the article.
4. Write a rough-draft introductory paragraph giving identifying information and leading into the subject.

Reading

appendix A continues

Appendix A (continued)

1. Identify facts and opinions in sample passages.
2. Identify the points of view used in sample passages.
3. Identify the author's purpose for sample passages.

5. Write a rough-draft concluding paragraph summing up the content of the article by expressing a value judgement regarding strength(s) and weakness(es).
6. Title the critique.
7. Revise and edit the series of paragraphs in response groups.
8. Publish: Give the final draft to the teacher for display

appendix A continues

Appendix A (continued)

on the classroom

bulletin board.

EVALUATION:

1) Informal: Teacher observation

Check of comprehension (using practice)

2) Formal: Final draft of critique

- -

Lesson Plan IV

WRITING OBJECTIVES:

To express personal feelings and ideas.

To write a connected series of paragraphs.

READING OBJECTIVES

To identify in a written passage fact-opinion, point of view, and author's purpose.

PURPOSE: To express personal feelings and ideas in an essay.

AUDIENCE: The members of the class, the teacher, and readers of a local newspaper, The Green River Republican.

PROCEDURE TIME: One week

ACTIVITIES:

Writing

1. Read John Steinbeck's essay from "Travels with Charley," and an excerpt from Joan Didion's essay "Los Angeles

Reading

appendix A continues

Appendix A (continued)

Notebook" as models
for writing.

2. Group work: Identify
the characteristics of
an essay found in the two
readings (e.g., one subject,
personal point of view).

1. Identify facts and
opinions from Didion's
"Los Angeles Notebook."
2. Identify points of
view used in the two
readings.
3. Identify the authors'
purposes in the two
readings.

3. Write a brief essay
in rough-draft form
in which you present
convincing details
(e.g., examples,
statistics, anecdotes)
to support your point
of view about the topic.

appendix A continues

Appendix A (continued)

In your essay, state your topic and your opinion on it in your opening or closing sentence.

4. Title the essay.
5. Revise and edit the essay in response groups.
6. Publish: Each response group will choose a favorite to be read to the class.

Give the final draft to the teacher for possible submission and publication in a local newspaper.

EVALUATION:

1) Informal: Teacher observation

2) Formal: Final draft of essay

- -

appendix A continues

Appendix A (continued)

Lesson Plan V

WRITING OBJECTIVES:

To express personal feelings.

To write a friendly letter.

READING OBJECTIVES:

To identify in a written passage the cause-effect relations.

PURPOSE: To express personal feelings in a letter of appreciation or thanks.

AUDIENCE: The members of the response group, the teacher, and the individual to whom the letter is written.

PROCEDURE TIME: One week

ACTIVITIES:

Writing

1. Read three letters of appreciation or thanks as models for writing.

2. Make a list of important people in your life. Choose one person to whom you would like to express appreciation.

Reading

1. Identify the cause-effect relations within the three letters read.

appendix A continues

Appendix A (continued)

3. Write a letter of appreciation or thanks to this individual in rough-draft form. Follow the guides for writing a friendly letter. State specificially why you are thankful. Tell how you plan to use the gift or how the person's consideration has benefited you.

4. Practice (overhead, handouts) identification and correction of mechanics, usage, and structure problems (Many examples of problems may be taken directly from the rough-draft letters).

5. Revise rough-draft letters independently.

6. Edit rough-draft letters in response groups.

appendix A continues

Appendix A (continued)

7. Properly address an envelope for your letter (Follow the guides).
8. Publish: The teacher will read the final draft and the envelope. The final-draft letter may be mailed to whom it was written.

EVALUATION:

1) Informal: Check of comprehension (practices)
2) Formal: Final draft of letter

- -

Lesson Plan VI

WRITING OBJECTIVES:

To express personal feelings and ideas.

To write a business letter.

READING OBJECTIVES:

To identify in a written passage the cause-effect relations and persuasion.

PURPOSE: To express personal feelings and ideas in a business letter.

AUDIENCE: The members of the response groups, the teacher, and the individual to whom the letter is written.

PROCEDURE TIME: One week

appendix A continues

Appendix A (continued)

ACTIVITIES:

Writing

1. Define and discuss terrorism. Examine pictures showing the effects of terrorism.
2. Brainstorm ways to control terrorism (for example, a U.N. peace control could be a cause which might result in control of terrorism, an effect).
3. Read three business letters as models for writing.
4. Write a business letter to your Congressman in

Reading

1. Identify the cause-effect relations within the three letters read.
2. Identify instances of persuasion within the three letters read.

appendix A continues

Appendix A (continued)

rough-draft form.
Follow the guides for
writing a business
letter. State your
purpose, to persuade
your Congressman to
control terrorism, at
the beginning of your
letter. Suggest a means
to control terrorism.
Write in second person.
Be brief, clear, and
courteous. The entire
body of the letter should
relate to the purpose.

5. Revise and edit rough-draft letters in response groups.
6. Properly address an envelope for your letter (Follow the guides).
7. Publish: The teacher will read the final draft and the envelope.

appendix A continues

Appendix A (continued)

The final-draft letter

may be mailed to your

Congressman.

EVALUATION:

1) Informal: Check of comprehension (practices)

2) Formal: Final draft of letter

Appendix B

Prompts for Writing Samples

Pre-sample Writing

Situation: Schools contain many objects often taken for granted, such as a water fountain, locker, bulletin board, or audio-visual aid. Become an object commonly found in or around a school. Write a description (approximately one page) of yourself, your surroundings, a typical day, and your feelings. Your audience will be the class and your teacher.

- -

Post-sample Writing

Situation: Christmas is a time to enjoy ornaments, wreaths, flowers, candles, cards, trees, and home-made treats. Become one of these items. Write a description (approximately one page) of yourself, your surroundings, a typical day, and your feelings. Your audience will be the class and your teacher.

Appendix C

Rating Scale for Writing Samples

5 Excellent:

Deals with prompt.

Has clear statement of vantage point.

Uses excellent description.

Uses details, concrete examples.

Uses innovative idea.

Logically presented.

4 Good:

Deals with prompt.

Has clear statement of vantage point.

Contains description (may be more predictable or vague than a 5 paper).

Uses details (lacks the specificity of a 5 paper).

Predictable idea.

Well presented.

3 Average:

Deals with prompt minimally.

Has clear vantage point.

Has vague description.

Details are sketchy.

Predictable idea.

Sketchily presented.

appendix C continues

Appendix C (continued)

2 Poor:

Deals with only part of prompt's demands.

Has clear vantage point.

Has little description.

Weak use of details.

Predictable idea.

Very sketchily presented.

1 Deficient:

May not focus on prompt.

May not identify vantage point, or may be unclear.

Contains very weak description, if present.

Little or no details; irrelevant details may be included.

Sentence structure/diction interferes with sense of paper.

References

Askew, L. (1983). The Gothic route to reading and writing. English Journal, 72(3), 102-103.

Atwell, N. (1984). Writing and reading literature from the inside out. Language Arts, 61(3), 240-252.

Aulls, M.W. (1985). Understanding the relationship between reading and writing. Educational Horizons, 64(1), 39-44.

Calkins, L.M. (1983). Make the reading-writing connection. Learning, 12(2), 82-83, 85-86.

Collins, C. (1985). The power of expressive writing in reading comprehension. Language Arts, 62(1), 48-54.

Cowin, G. (1986). Implementing the writing process with sixth graders: Jumanji, literature unit. The Reading Teacher, 40(2), 156-161.

Cunningham, P.M., & Cunningham, J.W. (1987). Content area reading-writing lessons. The Reading Teacher, 40(6), 506-512.

DeFord, D.E. (1981). Literacy: Reading, writing, and other essentials. Language Arts, 58(6), 652-658.

Eckhoff, B. (1983). How reading affects children's writing. Language Arts, 60(5), 607-616.

Flood, J., Lapp, D., & Farnan, N. (1986). A reading-writing procedure that teaches expository paragraph structure. The Reading Teacher, 39(6), 556-562.

Goodman, K., & Goodman, Y. (1983). Reading and writing relationships: Pragmatic functions. Language Arts, 60(5), 590-599.

Heffron, K. (1986). Literacy with the computer. The Reading Teacher, 40(2), 152-155.

Hennings, D.G. (1982). A writing approach to reading comprehension -- schema theory in action. Language Arts, 59(1), 8-17.

Kentucky Department of Education. (1986). Program of studies for Kentucky schools, grades K-12. Frankfort, KY: State Board of Education.

Kentucky Revised Statute 158.770. (1986).

Lapointe, A. (1986). The state of instruction in reading and writing in U.S. elementary schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(2), 135-138.

Linn, R.L. (1985). Review of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Forms U and V. In J.V. Mitchell, Jr. (Ed.), The ninth mental measurements yearbook: Vol. 1. Lincoln, NE: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurements, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Popham, W.J., & Sirotnik, K.A. (1973). Educational statistics: Use and interpretation (2nd. ed.). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Rosenshine, B.V. (1986). Synthesis of research on explicit teaching. Educational Leadership, 43(7), 60-69.

Sauers, F.W. (1987). Ménage à trois: Reading, writing, and rhetoric. College Teaching, 35(1), 23-25.

Shanahan, T. (1984). Nature of the reading-writing relation: An exploratory multivariate analysis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76(3), 466-477.

Shephard, L.A. (1985). Review of Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. In J.V. Mitchell, Jr. (Ed.), The ninth mental measurements yearbook: Vol. 1. Lincoln, NE: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurements, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Silvers, P. (1986). Process writing and the reading connection. The Reading Teacher, 39(7), 684-688.

Smith, F. (1983). Reading like a writer. Language Arts, 60(5), 558-567.

Stotsky, S. (1983). Research on reading/writing relationships: A synthesis and suggested directions. Language Arts, 60(5), 627-642.

Thomas, B. (1981). Re-reading re-writing. CEA Forum, 11(3), 1-6.

Tierney, R.J., & Pearson, P.D. (1983). Toward a composing model of reading. Language Arts, 60(5), 568-580.

Trosky, O.S., & Wood, C.C. (1982). Using a writing model to teach reading. Journal of Reading, 26(1), 34-40.

United States Department of Education. (1986). What works: Research about teaching and learning. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

Wilson, M.J. (1981). A review of recent research on the integration of reading and writing. The Reading Teacher, 34(8), 896-901.

Wittrock, M.C. (1983). Writing and the teaching of reading. Language Arts, 60(5), 600-606.